

Factors Affecting the Users' Satisfaction on the Electronic Medical Record System

JiYoung Kim, Youngmoon Chae¹

Department of Medical Record, Pundang Jesaeng General Hospital, Daejin Medical Center
Department of Health Management Information System, Yonsei University¹

Abstract

For last five years, several newly opened hospitals have introduced the order communicating system (OCS) along with an electronic medical record (EMR) system for inpatient and outpatient. Since EMR often changed the operating procedures and therefore caused user resistance to change, there is a need for strategy for increase a user acceptance toward the system. The purpose of this study was to identify the factors influencing user satisfaction to EMR for the hospital which has been operating EMR for four years since its opening in 1998. The results were as follows: First, satisfaction level was high for the screen layout, but low for the document image retrieval. Second, overall satisfaction score was highly correlated with twelve variables. Third, the factors significantly affecting the overall satisfaction level were 20 years age group, certified doctors, and the usage period between 1 and 2 years. Based on the about results, the followings were recommended to the hospitals which plan to introduce EMR in the future: First, data entry should be simplified and user friendly. Second, users should be well trained on security of the system in order to protect the confidentiality and integrity of the system prior to the installation of EMR system. Third, size of the files should be minimized using diagnostic codes and reducing size of image files in order to increase the response time. Finally, EMR should be well designed in such a way to improve a quality of contents of the chart. (*Journal of Korean Society of Medical Informatics* 8-4,39~53, 2002)

Keyword : Electronic Medical Record, User Satisfaction

I.

4)

1.

Burkle⁵⁾

90

1994 S

(Order

Communicating System)

(hard ware)가

(software)

1995

(peopleware)

6)

가

1998

J

J

(Hospital Information System)

가

(Chart Editor)

(Automatic Indexing Scanning)

가

가

40

45%가

1)

2.

가

2)

1998

3)

J

4

6가

가

가

2.

가.

2002 4 15 4 30

5 Likert

(1 : . 5 :)

II.

Dean(1999)

QUIS(The Questionnaire for User Interaction Satisfaction)

3

7)

5가

5가

1.

(5)

(5)

(6)

(2)

(6)

(Cronbach's

J

alpha) 0.75

J

SPSS 8.0

6

5

가

Cronbach Alpha

Cronbach

Alpha

77

45

58.5%

86.0%

90%

75.8%

가 가

1

가

Cronbach Alpha

0.6

SPSS

0.8

8)

Table1.

	(Cronbach Alpha)
	0.7245
	0.8000
	0.8591
	0.8219

- Cronbach Alpha 0.7245 0.8591
- 가
- :
- (Chart Editor)
- (Slip Manager)가
- :
- 가
- 1)
- :
- 20 30
- 40 50
- () :
- 3)
- Dean
- 가
- 가
- :
- 가
- :
- 1 2 3 3
- 2)
- :
- 가
- Dean (1998)
- 4)

가

1)

가

(ANOVA)

2)

가

가

가

(Correlation analysis)

3)

5)

Dean (1998)

(Multiple Regression Analysis)

III.

가

1.

2

20

30

34.4%

30

40

53.3%

87.7%

가 40

49.2%

50.8%

32.8%

30.3%

36.9%

47.5%

가 3

(bedside data entry)

2.

Table 2. (: ,%)

	20-29	42	34.4
	30-39	65	53.3
	40-49	13	10.7
	50	2	1.6
		60	49.2
		62	50.8
		40	32.8
		37	30.3
		45	36.9
	1	31	25.4
	1 2	23	18.9
	2 3	10	8.2
	3	58	47.5

Table 3. (: ,%)

					χ^2
20 - 29	32(76.2)	9(21.4)	1(2.4)	42(100.0)	45.88*
30 - 39	29(44.6)	32(49.2)	4(6.2)	65(100.0)	
40 - 49	5(38.5)	4(30.8)	4(30.8)	13(100.0)	
50	1(50.0)	0(0.0)	1(50.0)	2(100.0)	
	17(42.5)	19(47.5)	4(10.0)	40(100.0)	26.11*
	13(35.1)	18(48.6)	6(16.2)	37(100.0)	
	37(82.2)	8(17.8)	0(0.0)	45(100.0)	
1	16(51.6)	12(38.7)	3(9.7)	31(100.0)	4.35
2	14(60.8)	9(39.2)	0(0.0)	23(100.0)	
3	6(60.0)	3(30.0)	1(10.0)	10(100.0)	
3	31(53.4)	21(36.2)	6(10.3)	58(100.0)	

: *p < 0.01

가 (P<0.01).

3

20 30 762%, 30 1 51.6%, 38.7%, 9.7%

40 44.6%

20 40 83.6%가 39.1%, 2 3 60.8%,

60.0%, 30.0%, 10.0% 3

53.4%, 36.2%, 10.3%

(P<0.01).

42.5%, 47.5%, 100%, 3.

35.1%, 48.6%, 16.2%

82.2%, 17.8%

가 가

가 가

Table 4. (: ,%)

	64(52.5)	37(30.3)	21(17.2)	122(100.0)
	51(41.8)	34(27.9)	37(30.3)	122(100.0)
	61(50.0)	36(29.5)	25(20.5)	122(100.0)
	51(41.8)	36(29.5)	45(36.9)	122(100.0)
	42(34.5)	57(46.7)	23(18.9)	122(100.0)
	34(27.9)	54(44.3)	34(27.9)	122(100.0)
	22(18.0)	45(36.9)	55(45.1)	122(100.0)
	21(17.2)	57(46.7)	44(36.0)	122(100.0)
()	18(14.8)	36(29.5)	68(55.7)	122(100.0)
()	20(16.4)	37(30.3)	65(53.3)	122(100.0)
	33(27.0)	40(32.8)	49(40.2)	122(100.0)
	51(41.8)	44(36.1)	27(22.1)	122(100.0)

41.8%

4

1)

4.

52.5% (Slip Manager)
(Chart Editor)

가.

5

41.8%,
50.0%

가

(P<0.01).

2)

41.8% 가 가

가 가

34.5%

가 가

27.9%

가 가

3)

18.0%,
17.2%

6

14.8% 가

가

16.4%

(P<0.01).

20

가

40

가

20

4)

가 가

40

가 가

27.0%

Table5.

		F
	3.12	11.04**
	3.32	
	2.72	
	2.78	7.79**
	3.01	
	2.41	
	3.32	4.79**
	3.63	
	3.19	
	3.00	6.71**
	3.22	
	2.66	
	3.36	12.69**
	3.41	
	2.55	

: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01

Table 6.

			F
	20 - 29	2.75	19.83**
	30 - 39	3.14	
	40 - 49	3.38	
	50	3.09	
	20 - 29	2.50	13.29**
	30 - 39	2.80	
	40 - 49	3.00	
	50	2.60	
	20 - 29	3.25	5.15**
	30 - 39	3.43	
	40 - 49	3.43	
	50	3.33	
	20 - 29	2.64	11.57**
	30 - 39	3.05	
	40 - 49	3.35	
	50	3.00	
	20 - 29	2.58	25.51**
	30 - 39	3.26	
	40 - 49	3.73	
	50	3.25	

: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01

7

1

2

가 가

Table 8.

		F
	2.50	14.17
	2.91	
	2.57	
	3.00	2.41
	3.13	
	2.64	
	2.95	13.61**
	3.02	
	2.04	
	3.30	7.13*
	3.18	
	2.42	
	2.80	1.89
	3.08	
	2.73	
	3.10	1.55
	3.21	
	2.86	
	3.27	1.52
	3.59	
	3.26	
	3.25	3.63
	3.48	
	3.02	
	3.47	4.12
()	4.05	
	3.51	
	3.52	1.32
()	3.75	
	3.40	
	3.67	12.49**
	3.64	
	2.71	
	3.05	8.70**
	3.18	
	2.40	

: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01

0.801
(P<0.01).

10

20

1

가

0.215

IV.

가

가

가

MRI(Medical Record
EMR

Institute) 1999

가

가

가

가

가

(Chart Editor)

Dean⁷⁾

(Slip Manager)

가 가

가 가

가

가 가

가

가 가

20

가 가

40

가

20

가

40

가

가

가

EMR

가

Gamm⁹⁾

가 Lorenzi¹⁰⁾

5

가

가

1 2

가 가 , 3

가 가 . Gamm¹¹⁾

EMR

12

가 가

가

가

BICS

12)

(Brigham & Women's Integrated Computing System)

QUIS(Questionnaire for User Interaction

Satisfaction) , 가

가

13)

가

가

(Content Validity)

EMR

가

가

14)

가

75.8%

58.8%

가

가

가

V.

J

(structured data)

가

2002. 4. 15

2002. 4. 30

가 가

(risk)

가

가 가

가

6

20

1

2

가

가

가

가

가

1

2

가

3

가

(alert)
supporting system)

(decision

가 가

가

1. Dowling AF. Do hospital staff interface with computer system implementation?, Health Care Management Review, 1980;5:23-32.
2. , 1990.
3. DeLone. Information System success. Information system research, 1992;3(1):60-65.
4. 가 , 1992;2(1).
5. Burkle T. The impact of computer implementation on nursing work patterns : Study design and preliminary results. MEDINFO, 1995.
6. , 1996.
7. Dean F, Kuperman GJ, Fiskio J. Evaluating physician satisfaction regarding user interactions with an electronic medical record system, AMIA, 1999:400-404.
8. SAS , 1993.
9. Gamm LD, Barsukiewicz CK, Dansky KH et al. Pre-and post-control model research on end-users ' satisfaction with an electronic medical record : preliminary results. AMIA, 1998:225-229.
10. Lorenzi NM. Preparing your organizations for technological change. Health Informatics, 1990:33-34.
11. Gamm LD, Barsukiewicz CK, Dansky KH et al. Investigating changes in end-user satisfaction with installation an electronic medical record in ambulatory care settings. JHIM, 1998;12(4):53-65.
12. Niederman F. Information systems management issues. MIS Quarterly, 1991:475-500.
13. Massaro TA. Introducing physician order entry at a Major Academic Medical Center : Impact on organizational culture and behavior. Academic Medicine, 1993;68(1):20-30.
14. , 2000.